



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/719,370	12/11/2000	Jean-Pierre Martiniere	324-137	6471

7590 04/04/2005

Lowe Hauptman Gopstein
Gilman & Berner
Suite 310
1700 Diagonal Road
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/719,370

Applicant(s)

MARTINIERE, JEAN-PIERRE

Examiner

Ashok B. Patel

Art Unit

2154

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 12, 14-24 and 26-32.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-11, 13, 25, 33 and 34.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See continuation sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____



**JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**

Continuation sheet:

Applicant's argument:

In contrast, the method of Applicant's amended claim 12 includes a manager equipment unit primary equipment units, and does not need three types of home devices. In particular, the method of amended claim 12 does not need the combination of (1) a configuration manage connected to the home network column 2, line 64, through column 3, line 3) to maintain a list of currently connected home devices (column 25, claims 3 and 4, column 26. and claims 16 and 17): (2) second home devices that store user interface data and (3) a first home device 102 for displaying, in combination with the user interface data, from second devices for thereby controlling the second devices only from the first device (See Humpleman. columns 24 and 25.- claim 1).

Examiner's response:

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., In contrast, the method of Applicant's amended claim 12 includes a manager equipment unit primary equipment units, and does not need three types of home devices.) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

And reference teaches at col. 5, line 21-23," a first device fetches a GUI from a second device, to permit user interaction with the GUI to control the second device." Thus the reference teaches two devices interacting, one being a primary equipment among the primary equipment units and the other being a manager equipment.

The reference teaches in col. 11, line 50-55, "In certain configurations, a plurality of home devices with DHCP server capabilities may exist on a single home network. Therefore, in certain embodiments, an arbitration protocol is employed to select and designate a particular home device to function as the DHCP server for the home network."

Thereby the reference teaches that the third device (106) is not needed as the Applicant argues.

Applicant's argument:

Humpleman does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of former claims 13 or 25, now amended claims 12 and 24. In particular: Humpleman does not disclose composing a home page which is downloaded into at least any one primary equipment unit. Humpleman also fails to disclose the claim 14 limitation of displaying a home page in one display mode used in said one primary equipment unit.

Examiner's response:

The reference teaches "As depicted in FIG. 1, DTV 102, DVCR 110, DVD 108, DSS-NIU 104 and security system 120 represent home devices that are currently connected to the home network 100. A client-server relationship exists among the attached devices, with the DTV 102 typically behaving as the client and home devices DVCR 110, DVD 108, DSS-NIU 104 and security system 120 behaving as servers.", col. 6, line 54-60.

The reference teaches in col. 7, line 49-58, "As previously stated, each home device connected to the home network has one or more associated HTML files. The HTML files for a respective home device define the control and command functions for that particular home device. Each HTML file may also contain embedded references to other related HTML files. A device connected to the home network that has a viewable display (e.g., screen) and employs the browser technology may receive and interpret the HTML files associated with the home devices connected to the home network, and graphically display the information contained therein using a GUI on its screen. "

And reference teaches at col. 5, line 21-23," a first device fetches a GUI from a second device, to permit user interaction with the GUI to control the second device."

Thus the reference teaches composing a home page which is downloaded into at least any one primary equipment unit and displaying a home page in one display mode used in said one primary equipment unit.